

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 and 15-19 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 19 are amended. Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found in the specification, for example, at page 22, line 3 - page 27, line 18; and claim 19 is amended for form. No new matter is added.

**I. Claim 19 Satisfies Formal Requirements**

Claim 19 is objected for informalities. By this Amendment, claim 19 is amended responsive to the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is thus respectfully requested.

**II. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**

Claims 1, 6, 7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,763,399 to Margalit et al. ("hereinafter "Margalit"); claims 2, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Margalit in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,359,699 to Yoneta et al. (hereinafter "Yoneta"); claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Margalit in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,111,659 to Murata; and claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Margalit in view of Yoneta and Murata. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

None of the applied references teaches or would have rendered obvious a function implementing unit that, when instruction data is stored in the storing unit via the interface by the external personal computer, automatically reads the instruction data, determines a process to implement one of the one or more functions corresponding to the read instruction data and executes the determined process, as recited in independent claim 1.

The Office Action asserts CPU 30 of Margalit corresponds to a function implementing unit. However, Margalit merely discloses writing data to and reading data from the memory in accordance with instructions from USB host 20. See, e.g., Figure 1. When the USB host instructs to write data to the memory, the CPU 30 does not automatically read the data stored

therein and does not determine a process to implement a function corresponding to the data read from the memory. Thus, Margalit does not disclose the claimed function implementing unit.

Further, the other applied references do not remedy the above-described deficiencies of Margalit.


Thus, for at least these reasons, independent claim 1 is patentable over the applied references. Further, claims 2-7 and 15-19, which depend on independent claim 1, are also patentable for at least their dependency on independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

### **III. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs  
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/mcp

Date: July 2, 2009

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------